FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Global
Country (ies):	Global
Project Title:	Sustainable Management of Tuna Fisheries and Biodiversity Conservation in the Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/GLO/365/GFF
GEF ID:	4581
GEF Focal Area(s):	Biodiversity International Waters
Project Executing Partners:	• Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT), • Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), • International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT), • Indian Ocean Tuna Commission (IOTC), • Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) • Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), • Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector Organization of the Central American Isthmus (OSPESCA), • Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA), • Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), • Government of Fiji • Government of Ghana, • United States National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), • BirdLife International (BLI), • International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF), • World Wildlife Fund (WWF) • International Seafood Sustainability Association (ISSA) • Fiji Tuna Boat Owners Association (FTBOA) now Fiji Fisheries Industry Association (FFIA) • Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) • Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) • Organización Productores Asociados Grandes Atuneros Congeladores (OPAGAC) • Seychelles Fishing Authority (SFA) • European Commission DG MARE
Project Duration:	5 years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	11/11/2013
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01/15/2014
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE[1]:	01/14/2019
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) [2]	12/31/2019
Actual Implementation End Date[3]:	-

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 27,172,936
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc[4]:	USD 150,805,100
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	USD 23,612,138
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019[5]	USD 265,015,446

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	08-10 July 2019
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	Q3/Q4 2016
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	July 2016-May 2017
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	-
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required[6]	Yes

[1] as per FPMIS

[2] In case of a project extension.

[3] Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

[4] This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

[5] Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	S
Overall implementation progress rating:	S
Overall risk rating:	M

Status

Implementation Status *(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):*	Final PIR

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Alejandro Anganuzzi Global Project Coordinator Fisheries and Aquaculture Department	Alejandro.Anganuzzi@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Nicolas Gutierrez Fishery Resources Officer Fisheries and Aquaculture Department	Nicolas.Gutierrez@fao.org
Budget Holder	Jacqueline Alder Fishcode Manager Fisheries and Aquaculture Department	Jacqueline.Alder@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Kuena Morebotsane, Technical Officer Investment Centre Division (TCI) Technical Cooperation Department	GEF-Coordination-Unit@fao.org Kuena.Morebotsane@fao.org

[6] Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)	Baseline level	Mid-term target[7]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating [8]
Project objective: to achieve efficiency and sustainability in tuna production and biodiversity conservation in the ABNJ, through the systematic application of an ecosystem approach in tuna fisheries	Number of stocks of major commercial tuna species which are subject to overfishing	**13 out of 23 stocks** PO-ALB-N,AO-ALB-S, AO-ALB-M, IO-ALB, EPO-BET, WPO-BET, AO-BET, PO-PBF, AO-BFT-W, SH-SBT, EPO-YFT, WPO-YFT, AO-YFT	Not identified	Decrease	**5 out of 23 stocks** EPO-BET, AO-BET, PO-PBF, EPO-YFT, IO-YFT	S
	Joint initiatives of tuna RFMOs addressing priorities identified in the Kobe framework and by t-RFMO members	Kobe MSE and BYC WGs established, funds lacking	Not identified	Support to at least three initiatives	**Total of 4:** - Joint t-RFMO meeting on EBFM implementation, held 2016, second meeting planned for September 2019 - Joint t-RFMO meetings on FADs, held in 2017 and 2019 - Joint Working group on MSE, two meetings held in 2016 and 2018 - Tuna Compliance Network, three workshops held in 2017, 2018, 2019 and ongoing online.	
	Major commercial stocks of targeted tuna species with harvest control rules adopted	**1 stock:** SBT	Not identified	6 stocks	**6 stocks:** SBT, EPO-BET, EPO-YFT, EPO-SKJ, IO-SKJ, AO-ALB-N Workplans and timelines for adoption of management procedures have been adopted at ICCAT, IOTC, and WCPFC. CCSBT is revising their management procedure for southern bluefin tuna	

[7] Many projects did not identify mid-term targets at the design stage therefore this column should only be filled if relevant.

[8] Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Marginally Satisfactory** (MS), **Marginally Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU).

	Overall compliance in IOTC, ICCAT and WCPFC (CCSBT and IATTC do not produce overall compliance scores)	**IOTC** 2012**:** 46% overall compliance **ICCAT** 2012 Percentage of CPCs with No compliance issues: 20 Some degree of non-compliance: 25 Serious issues of non-compliance: 7 **WCPFC** 2013**:** Compliant CCMs: 15 Non-compliant CCMs: 21 Not applicable CCMs: 3	Not identified	Improved overall compliance	**IOTC** 2018: 68% overall compliance **ICCAT** 2017: Percentage of CPCs with: No compliance issues: 16 Some degree of non-compliance: 39 Serious issues of non-compliance: 1 **WCPFC** 2017: NA (system changed)	
	Number of new tuna RFMO CMMs or data rules addressing bycatch issues	**NA**		New measures	**Sharks: 5 in total:** 1 Shark CMM (IATTC, Res C-16-06) 2 Shark observer data improvement initiatives (WCPFC and IATTC) 2 Shark data harmonization initiatives (WCPFC and IOTC) **Turtles: 1 in total:** 1 turtle CMM requires mitigation for all shallow set longline fisheries (WCPFC, (WCPFC, CMM 2018-04) **Non-Entangling FADs: 4 in total:** ICCAT requirement (Rec. 15-01) IOTC gradual adoption (Res 15/08) IATTC encourages (Resolution C-15-03) WCPFC requirement from 2020 onwards (CMM 2018-01)	

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating
IO1. Elements of Harvest strategies for selected commercial tuna stocks developed	Progress towards the full adoption of harvest strategies/management procedures for stocks of targeted species	No development or development of harvest strategies in very early stages in tuna RFMOs, except CCSBT where a HS is adopted.	Not identified	Significant progress for 10 stocks	**6 completed:** SBT, EPO-BET, EPO-YFT, EPO-SKJ, IO-SKJ, AO-ALB-N **8 ongoing:** AO-BFT, IO-BET, IO-YFT, IO-ALB, IO-SWO, WPO-YFT, WPO-BET, WPO-SKJ	HS
	Number of proposed/adopted CMMs containing elements of harvest strategies/management procedures	Discussions on HS/MPs in very initial stages in all t-RFMOs (except CCSBT). **ICCAT:** 1 relevant proposal/ 1 adopted CMM before 2014 **WCPFC**: 0 relevant proposals before 2014 **IOTC:** 0 relevant proposals before 2014 **IATTC:** 0 relevant proposals before 2014	Not identified	Increase	**ICCAT:** 9 relevant proposals/ 8 adopted CMMS **WCPFC:** 13 relevant proposals/ 2 adopted CMMs **IOTC:** 9 relevant proposals/ 4 adopted CMMs **IATTC:** 7 proposals/ 3 adopted	
IO2. Roadmaps to operationalise EAFM/EBFM in t-RFMOs developed and submitted for adoption	Regional model roadmaps for EAFM/EBFM operationalization developed and submitted to t-RFMOs	Management frameworks address target stocks but do not address associated species and ecosystems.	Not identified	Developed and submitted in one t-RFMO	Some elements have been adopted, but not as a comprehensive framework (all t-RFMOs).	MS
IO3. Improved shark fisheries management framework (proposed) across the Pacific	Improvements in management of shark bycatch issues in the two Pacific tuna RFMOs (and beyond, if the project was involved)	NA	Not identified	2 new processes, initiatives and guidelines addressing shark bycatch issues in the two Pacific tuna RFMOs (and beyond, if the project was involved)	**Total of 6:** - Safe release guidelines for sharks (other than whale sharks) (WCPFC, 2018) - Safe release guidelines for mantas and mobulids (WCPFC, 2017) - Inter-sessional Working Group–Sharks established to develop a comprehensive shark CMM (WCPFC, 2017) - Designation of manta and mobulids as key species (WCPFC, 2016)	HS

					- Safe release guidelines for whale sharks (WCPFC, 2015) - Central American Port Sampling continued under IATTC funding (IATTC, 2018)	
Project objective and Outcomes	**Description of indicator(s)**	**Baseline level**	**Mid-term target**	**End-of-project target**	**Level at 30 June 2019**	**Progress rating**
IO4. Bycatch mitigation best practices adopted by RFMOs and/or targeted tuna vessels	Improved bycatch data from the Northern Indian Ocean gill net fishery	Initial report on the Northern Indian Ocean gillnet fishery highlights significant data gaps.	Not identified	Data reported to IOTC enabling IOTC to estimate the bycatch in those fisheries.	WWF has shared the data from the crew-observer/logbook program and IOTC has provided inputs on the need to revise database design. IOTC Secretariat has reviewed the data being reported by Pakistan on the revised catch time series and intends to prepare a joint paper, documenting this and the criteria used for the revision of official catch estimates.	S
	Percentage of Pakistani tuna gillnet vessels with on-board crew observer completing logbooks	No Pakistani tuna gillnet vessels with on-board crew observer completing logbooks	Not identified	15% of Pakistani tuna gillnet vessels with on-board crew observer completing logbooks	An **estimated 12-15% Pakistani tuna gillnet vessels** with on-board crew observer completing logbooks. This coverage should be seen with reference to mandatory observer coverage of 5% for IOTC member countries.	
	Number of references in BMIS and number of users and page-views	Information is limited to WCPFC with significant data and knowledge gaps for all ocean regions. No user statistics available.	Not identified	New information on bycatch mitigation effectiveness for turtles and seabirds available in BMIS and being used.	The BMIS website, re-launched in May 2017, currently includes ~1,900 references from all oceans and has been widely used by more than 13,800 unique users who have viewed more than 50,200 pages. Visitation rates have risen steadily since the re-launch (893 visitors per month now versus 281 previously), propelled by Google selecting BMIS for a high-profile “snippet” feature at the top of search results for “bycatch management”	

	Level of compliance of purse seine vessels in the ISSF PVR with requirement 3.5 for non-entangling FADs	No data on use of non-entangling FADs available.	Not identified	Increase	ISSF Conservation measure 3.5 requiring transactions with vessels that use only non-entangling FADs became effective in October 2017. In 2019, 99.8% of the 554 purse seine vessels listed in the ISSF Proactive Vessel Registry (where this measure is applicable) are committed to implementing the measure on non-entangling FADs within 12 months of adoption. .	
	Percentage of tuna longline vessels of targeted fleets in IOTC and ICCAT implementing best practice seabird mitigation measures	South Africa (15 active vessels): 100%, high confidence Brazil (58 active vessels): 5%, medium confidence Korea (10 active vessels): 20%, medium confidence Namibia (7 active vessels) NA, no data available Overall uptake in targeted vessels: 22%	Not identified	40%	**2018 data:** South Africa (46 active vessels): 100%, high confidence Brazil: data were not available at the time of reporting, but use of measures is considered to be very low Korea (13 active vessels): 100%, high confidence Namibia (10 active vessels) 80%, high confidence Overall uptake in targeted vessels: Uncertain at this time	
Project objective and Outcomes	**Description of indicator(s)**	**Baseline level**	**Mid-term target**	**End-of-project target**	**Level at 30 June 2019**	**Progress rating**
IO5. Improved operational capabilities through improved MCS tools and better intelligence integration	Percentage of fishing operations in target countries covered by fully functioning EMS	0% (Ghana) 0% (Fiji)	Not identified	100% of fishing operations on Ghanian tuna purse seiners covered by fully functioning EMS 50% of fishing operations on Fijian tuna longliners covered by fully functioning EMS.	**14 out of 14** of active tuna purse seine vessels representing 100% of fishing operations (Ghana) **50 out of 89** active longline vessels in Fiji representing >50% of fishing operations	S

	Inclusion of requirements for EMS in fishing license conditions for targeted domestic fleets in pilot countries	No such requirements.	Not identified	EMS required in one country	**No such requirements.** Review of legislation is ongoing in Ghana with the possibility that EMS becomes mandatory. FAO assisted Fiji with revising legislation to broaden scope of the use of electronic means, which will be subject to consultations and possible adoption (with EMS as mandatory)	
	Number of observer incident reports generated by FFA regional surveillance and number of Vessel of Interest Reports identified through different sources of information	No such reports.	Not identified	400 observer incident reports and 100 of Vessel of Interest Reports.	**Over 1,240 observer incident reports**	
	Strengthened MCS toolbox (including improved CLAV, PSM templates, CDS Design options, MCS best practices) to fight IUU promoted across tuna RFMOs	CLAV exists, but is not updated regularly. Limited knowledge of CDS and PSMA legal requirements in countries.	Not identified	Improved data quality in the CLAV (duplicates eliminated, increased completion of minimum data requirements) PSMA legal templates published and widely used in FAO PSMA-related capacity building. Design options for development of catch documentation schemes published.	CLAV updated daily with improved data quality. PSMA legal templates completed and widely used in FAO PSMA-related capacity building. Design options for development of catch documentation schemes published.	

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating
IO6. Strengthened capacity of compliance officers in member states via capacity building and mechanisms for knowledge and experience sharing	Establishment a global competency-based certification program for tuna MCS embedded in a university program	No such program exists.	Not identified	Business plan that identifies potential financial backers, agreement on the hosting of the course at one university with a commitment (and resources) to run it for 5 years.	No such program exists. Discussions ongoing with FFA and several universities and review of current curriculum by FFA should form the basis for the business plan.	MS
	Number of MCS course-certified national fisheries staff from WCPFC region (FFA course)	0 staff certified	Not identified	70 staff certified	70 staff certified	

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating [9]

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
IO2. Roadmaps to operationalize EAFM/EBFM in t-RFMOs developed and submitted for adoption	Second joint t-RFMO WG will meet with participation of scientists and decision-makers to identify barriers to a more formal implementation. A consultant has been engaged to develop and present a proposed roadmap at ICCAT and IOTC	PMU	September 2019
IO6. Strengthened capacity of compliance officers in member states via capacity building and mechanisms for knowledge and experience sharing	The Project is commissioning a review of the curriculum of the existing course, that will be the template for the business plan for future implementation of courses in other regions, if possible under a second phase of the Project	PMU, FFA and consultant	November 2019

PMU

[9] To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs[10]	Expected completion date[11]	Achievements at each PIR[12]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[13] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
Component 1. Promotion of Sustainable Management of Tuna Fisheries, in accordance with an Ecosystem Approach								
1.1.1 Management Strategy Evaluation - Capacity building	30 Sep 2019	**Two successful workshop**s were held, and post-workshop surveys showed that participants left with positive expectations for their future engagement in fisheries management.	The proposal for an interim harvest control rule for IOTC SKJ was proposed by 16 developing countries. The **third workshop** was proposed for the end of March, but needed to be moved to August 2016.	**Four workshops** were held in 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017 the IOTC, ICCAT and IATTC regions. Planning for the next (fifth and sixth) workshops are underway. These two workshops will be focussed on the WCPFC	**Seven workshops** were held since 2014. Participants completed workshops with an increased understanding of fisheries management concepts, including harvest strategies.	**Eight workshops** were held since 2014. Participants completed workshops with an increased understanding of fisheries management concepts, including harvest strategies. Additional workshops on Management Strategy evaluation for tuna industries in key countries that operate in the Eastern Pacific Ocean started.	>100%	**Completed**

[10] Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new output in the table highlighting the variance in the comments section.

[11] As per latest workplan (latest project revision)

[12] Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators as much as possible

[13] Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

Outputs[10]	Expected completion date [11]	Achievements at each PIR[12]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[13] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
1.1.4 Management Strategy Evaluation-development	30 Sep 2019	**13** fisheries management personnel from coastal developing States whose participation in the MSE process was supported by the project. **One MSE process**-related meetings supported through support of experts, facilitators and resource persons.	**46** fisheries management personnel from coastal developing States whose participation in the MSE process was supported by the project **Three MSE process**-related meetings supported through support of experts, facilitators and resource persons.	**57** fisheries management personnel from coastal developing States whose participation in the MSE process was supported by the project **Eight MSE process**-related meetings supported through support of experts, facilitators and resource persons. Project supported the **first meeting of the Kobe Joint Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) Working Group**	**80** fisheries management personnel from coastal developing States whose participation in the MSE process was supported by the project **Ten MSE process**-related meetings where support was provided through support of experts, facilitators and resource persons. Project supported the **two meetings meeting of the Kobe Joint Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) Working Group**	**80** fisheries management personnel from coastal developing States whose participation in the MSE process was supported by the project **Ten MSE process**-related meetings where support was provided through support of experts, facilitators and resource persons. Project supported the **two meetings of the Kobe Joint Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) Working Group.** Technical support provided to the development of harvest strategies for **yellowfin and bigeye tuna in the Indian Ocean.**	95%	**On track** While it is feasible to complete the technical work on the MSE process in the lifetime of the Project, the formal adoption of harvest strategies for every major stock requires support from all the t-RFMO members, something that cannot be guaranteed.
1.1.5 Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries	30 Sep 2019	No direct plans for implementation of an EAFM, but there are elements	The co-Chair of the ICCAT Subcommittee on Ecosystems, Dr.	A three-day **Joint meeting of the tuna RFMOs on the implementation of**	The planning for a second meeting started during the reporting period,	**Joint meeting of the tuna RFMOs on the implementation of**	85%	**On track** Implementation of the ecosystem approach may be

Outputs[10]	Expected completion date [11]	Achievements at each PIR[12]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[13] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
(EAF) evaluations and plans		adopted. ICCAT has advanced the considerations of EAF plans by identifying key elements needed in operationalizing EAF plans. Discussions with ICCAT ongoing.	Alex Hanke, contacted the other t-RFMOs in February 2016 and all expressed interest in the proposed joint t-RFMO meeting to review the approaches of the various RFMOs and to advance in the concept of operationalization of the EAF. The meeting is planned in the week from 12-16 December 2016.	**the EBFM** to review the approaches of the various RFMOs and to advance in the concept of operationalization of the EAF took place in FAO HQ in Rome from 12-16 December 2016. During this reporting period, the report was finalized and distributed.	which should towards looking at plans for operationalizing the implementation of the EAF offer an opportunity to advance the dialogue by bringing together commissioners and scientists, and discuss the elements of those potential plans.	**the EBFM** to review the approaches of the various RFMOs and to advance in the concept of operationalization of the EAF took place in FAO HQ in Rome from 12-16 December 2016. A second meeting will be held in Rome in September 2019.		interpreted differently in different RFMOs. Not all RFMO Members consider that the development of EAF plans is a priority.
1.2.1 Review-Pilot Vessel Day Scheme	NA	Before the start of the Project, the Parties of the Nauru Agreement indicated that they wanted to complete the review independently of the Project intervention, which was done in September 2014. In December, the Project contacted the PNA who indicated that there would be no need	VDS scheme was reviewed independently from the project. There is still an opportunity to facilitate up-scaling and replication by assisting in presenting an unbiased review of the conditions that enabled PNA Members to benefit from the VDS.	No further development of this output.	The MTE recommended to eliminate this output.	-	N/A	**Not applicable** PNA has indicated its preference to advance this activity independently of the Project

Outputs[10]	Expected completion date [11]	Achievements at each PIR[12]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[13] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
		to utilize the funds earmarked for the review. The PMU is in contact with other initiatives to explore the possibility to collaborate in disseminating the lessons of the VDS experience to other regions in agreement with the output.						
1.2.2 Rights Based Management lessons learned	NA	In the absence of the PNA Vessel Day Scheme review, this activity has to be refocused to provide a general background on rights-based management. This activity, led by WWF, includes workshops for officials of developing States. The first workshop was held as a one-day workshop in conjunction with the MSE capacity building workshop in Sri Lanka in April 2014 involving 44 participants from	The first workshop highlighting social, economic and resource benefits to coastal developing states was held in 2014.	No further development of this output.	The MTE recommended to eliminate this output.	-	N/A	**Not applicable**

Outputs[10]	Expected completion date [11]	Achievements at each PIR[12]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[13] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
		18 countries.						
Component 2. Strengthening and Harmonizing Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) to Address Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported Fishing (IUU)								
2.1.1 Global best practices for Monitoring, Control and Surveillance	31 Dec 2019	A consultant to undertake the development of the MCS best practices has been identified, and ToRs for the work are being finalized. Discussions are being held for the constitution of a global Working Group of personnel working in compliance issues at the t-RFMOs, open as well to interested partners, that would serve both as a forum for consultation concerning the best practices document, as well as a mechanism for exchange of information.	A plan for the structure of the document is being discussed with interested partners. A first draft of the compilation of practices, in consultation with relevant officials from the RFMO compliance processes, expected to be ready by the end of 2015 or first quarter of 2016, is now scheduled to take place during the second half of 2016 and 2017	A LoA with ISSF for the development of the MCS Best Practices has been signed in November 2016 and a first draft Best Practices for seven MCS tools has been completed. The Core Group of the Tuna Compliance Network (Output 2.1.2), as well as other MCS experts, is currently reviewing the draft Best Practices and will provide feedback for finalization.	The draft seven MCS tools/chapters have gone through a revision process, taking advantage of the expertise available in the TCN. It was decided that the preferred approach would be the development of generic and practical MCS implementation sheets in a joint effort with the ABNJ Deep Seas Project, which could be published online.	MCS implementation sheets are under preparation for 15 thematic areas in a joint effort with the ABNJ Deep Seas Project. For the MCS sheets, each theme will present a synthesis with short and clear text, communicating clear messages combined with infographics to make them easy to understand and assimilate by national MCS managers and officers.	65%	**Some delay** Initial progress has been slow, due to the lack of staff resources at the PMU.
2.1.2 Monitoring, Control and Surveillance - network	30 June 2019	Consultations with officials from the International MCS Network have been successfully conducted and	Negotiations for a Memorandum of Understanding between the Project and the International MCS	A collaborative agreement has been in place with IMCSN since November 2016 for the development of	**Two meetings of the Tuna Compliance Network completed** (Spain, 27-31 March 2017	**Three meetings of the Tuna Compliance Network completed** (Spain, 27-31 March 2017,	>100%	**Completed**

Outputs[10]	Expected completion date [11]	Achievements at each PIR[12]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[13] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
		there is confirmation that there is interest to explore how to implement the sub-network of MCS officials associated with tuna fisheries.	Network to create a 'sub-network' are currently ongoing.	the subnetwork and a facilitator has been hired by the IMCSN to animate the network. Officers in charge of compliance in t-RFMOs Secretariats met during the **Inception Workshop of the Tuna Compliance Network** in Spain between 27-31 March 2017 with the dual objectives of establishing the Tuna Compliance Network (TCN) and sharing knowledge and experiences among them and other experts in fisheries MCS. As a tool to the Tuna Compliance Network, the Project has set up an online communication tool, Basecamp[14].	and FFA HQ in Honiara, Solomon Islands 15-18 February 2018). Combined with the TCN's Core Group, the Network encompasses 25 MCS and compliance experts.	FFA HQ in Honiara, Solomon Islands 15-18 February 2018 and Bangkok, Thailand 22-24 February 2019). The t-RFMOs and the International MCS Network have pledge support to the Tuna Compliance Network beyond the life of the project		

[14] https://basecamp.com

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date [16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
2.1.3 Monitoring, Control and Surveillance certification-based capacity building	31 Dec 2019	Development of a curriculum and a training strategy started.	Development of a curriculum and a training strategy is expected to be completed in early 2017. The Project has supported **one round** of the MCS course FFA is organizing in collaboration with the University of the South Pacific **16 MCS officers** from Pacific countries awarded with Certificate IV in Fisheries Enforcement and Compliance (FFA training course)	Development of a curriculum and a training strategy is experiencing some delays. The Project has supported **two rounds** of the MCS course FFA is organizing in collaboration with the University of the South Pacific with the second round involving 20 MCS professionals currently ongoing. **16 MCS officers** from Pacific countries awarded with Certificate IV in Fisheries Enforcement and Compliance (FFA training course)	FFA has presented a proposal to complete the preparation of the curriculum and explore ways to regionalize its content. The Project has supported three rounds of MCS courses FFA is organizing in collaboration with the University of the South Pacific. **55 MCS officers** from Pacific countries awarded with Certificate IV in Fisheries Enforcement and Compliance (FFA training course), additional ones still awaiting final	The Project has supported three rounds of MCS courses FFA is organizing in collaboration with the University of the South Pacific. **70 MCS officers** from Pacific countries awarded with Certificate IV in Fisheries Enforcement and Compliance (FFA training course).	50%	**Some delay** Curriculum development is experiencing some delay and no progress was made during this reporting period. Review of the curriculum ongoing by FFA. Additional sources of funding will be required to conduct the four workshops as indicated in the revised implementation strategy to benefit personnel from developing members of all RFMOs. Arrangements with academic institutions will be necessary in each region

[15] Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new output in the table highlighting the variance in the comments section.

[16] As per latest workplan (latest project revision)

[17] Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators as much as possible

[18] Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date [16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
					results.			
1.1.2 Compliance improvement	30 Sep 2019	**20 participations of national fisheries staff** were supported to participate in t-RFMO capacity building activities (covering IOTC, ICCAT and IATTC). **One training** organized by IOTC was supported.	**28 participations of national fisheries staff** were supported to participate in t-RFMO capacity building activities (covering IOTC, ICCAT and IATTC). **One IOTC Compliance Support Mission** was funded. **Two trainings** organized by IOTC were supported.	**55 participations of national fisheries staff** in t-RFMO capacity building activities (covering IOTC, ICCAT and IATTC) were supported. **Two IOTC Compliance Support Missions** were funded. **Two trainings** organized by IOTC were supported (support for Secretariat or resource persons) **Additional EMS pilot** in Seychelles almost completed. **Joint t-RFMO FAD working group meeting,** Madrid, 19-21 April 2017: 38 participants from developing countries supported (11 females)	**55 participations of national fisheries staff** in t-RFMO capacity building activities (covering IOTC, ICCAT and IATTC) were supported. **Two IOTC Compliance Support Missions** were funded. **Two trainings** organized by IOTC were supported (support for Secretariat or resource persons) **Additional EMS pilot** in Seychelles completed. **Joint t-RFMO FAD working group meeting**, Madrid, 19-21 April 2017: 38 participants from developing countries supported (11 females)	**55 participations of national fisheries staff** in t-RFMO capacity building activities (covering IOTC, ICCAT and IATTC) were supported. **Two IOTC Compliance Support Missions** were funded. **Two trainings** organized by IOTC were supported (support for Secretariat or resource persons) **Additional EMS pilot** in Seychelles completed. **Two Joint t-RFMO FAD working group meetings** Madrid, 19-21 April 2017 San Diego, USA, 08-10 May 2019 Support to the **development of**	95%	**On track** While the experience of IOTC with CSM has been very positive, the effectiveness ultimately depends on the commitment of the RFMO Members to implement the activities agreed in the roadmap to improve compliance.

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date [16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
					Support to the **development of online reporting systems** in IOTC (e-Maris) and ICCAT (FORS). Support to two meetings of the **ICCAT Port Inspection Expert Group for Capacity and Assistance** in 2017 and 2018.	**online reporting systems** in IOTC (e-Maris) and ICCAT (FORS). Support to two meetings of the **ICCAT Port Inspection Expert Group for Capacity and Assistance** in 2017 and 2018.		
2.1.4 Port State Measures legislation template	Dec 2015	Draft Port State measures legislative template completed by legal expert Judith Swan and already trialled in several regional and national activities.	The template has been completed taking a global and comprehensive approach, including: working from the FAO Agreement and the IOTC Resolution. The Launch of the template is planned for the 32nd Session of COFI (11-15 July 2016) during a celebration dedicated to the entry into force of the Port State Measures Agreement. The template is available online http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5801e.pdf The template has	Port State measures legislative template completed and published as an FAO publication. During the last year, translations into French and Spanish have been completed. The template has been used in national workshops involving **21 different countries and three regional activities** in Africa and Asia. The project supports PSMA-related capacity building exercises, in particular in	This output was successfully completed in 2016. The template has been used in national workshops involving **25 different countries and three regional activities** in Africa and Asia. Distribution of the PSMA legislative template **continues with nearly 3,000 hard copies in three languages** distributed so far.	This output was successfully completed in 2016. The template has been used in national workshops involving **25 different countries and three regional activities** in Africa and Asia. Distribution of the PSMA legislative template **continues with approximately 3,300 hard copies in three languages** distributed so far.	>100%	**Completed** Activities to support the implementation of the PSMA continue

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date [16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
			already been trialed in several regional and national activities, and it has become a reference on the subject.	IOTC.				
2.1.5 Consolidated List of Authorized Vessels and Global Record harmonized	30 Sep 2019	Work on the **automation of the CLAV** has been successfully completed in 2014. Data validation continued	Work on the **automation of the CLAV** has been successfully completed in 2014. Data validation continued.	Work on the **automation of the CLAV** has been successfully completed in 2014. After an unsupported recess period of six months (April-September 2016) where data quality started to decrease, data validation work resumed in October 2016.	Work on the **automation of the CLAV** has been successfully completed in 2014. Data validation continued	Work on the **automation of the CLAV** was successfully completed in 2014. Data validation continues	>100%	**Completed** Arrangements for continuation of maintenance of the new procedures and for future data quality control after the end of the Project will have to be discussed by the t-RFMOs.
2.2.1 Electronic monitoring Fiji longliners	31 Sep 2019	**Procurement procedures were completed**, and equipment is about to be deployed in the first batch of fishing vessels, starting the field activities. The Letter of Agreement between FAO and Government of Fiji is about to be	After completion of procurement and the contractual arrangement between the Fijian Ministry of Fisheries and Forests and FAO, the project is now fully running. **Five Fijian longliners are currently equipped** with EMS and	**16 Fijian longliners are equipped** with EMS. **Over 80 trips have been analysed**. In two rounds of training, **35 fisheries observers** and additional staff were trained in the analysis of the EMS data.	**43 Fijian longliners are equipped** are equipped with EMS, less Solander 4 which had sunk. A total **of 266 trips have been analysed** by the Fiji EMS unit since the beginning of the pilot activities. In two rounds of training, **35**	**50 Fijian longliners are equipped** with EMS. A total **of 386 trips have been analysed** by the Fiji EMS unit since the beginning of the pilot activities. In two rounds of training, **35 fisheries observers** and additional staff	95%	**On track**

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date [16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
		finalized. Both government and private sector continue to support the initiatives.	deployment will accelerate during the next batch, with 10 new vessels being equipped in July/August 2016. **17 land-based fisheries observers received training**. Land-based observers completed **review and analysis of 11 fishing trips**. EMS reviews are now being used as a tool to monitor compliance of the Fijian vessel.	Both the Government and the Private sector continue to support the initiative, and the MoU between the Ministry of Fisheries and Forests and the Industry Stakeholders has been vetted by the Solicitor General's Office and the Cabinet, and shall be signed in July 2017. EMS reviews are being used as a tool to monitor compliance of the Fijian vessel.	**fisheries observers** and additional staff were trained in the analysis of the EMS data. The MoU between the Government of Fiji via the Ministry of Fisheries and the Fiji Fishing Industry Association was signed on the 22nd of August 2017. EMS reviews are being used as a tool to monitor compliance of the Fijian vessel.	were trained in the analysis of the EMS data. EMS reviews are being used as a tool to monitor compliance of Fijian vessels. A **business case study including a comprehensive assessment of the costs and benefits** of implementing EM routinely has been completed and shared in the Western Central Pacific region.		
2.2.2 Electronic monitoring Ghana purse seiners	31 Dec 2018	Procurement procedures were completed, and equipment is about to be deployed in the first batch of fishing vessels, starting the field activities. WWF staff held several meetings with the Minister and Ghanaian officials in 2014.	After completion of procurement, all **11 Ghanaian active** purse seine vessels have been equipped with the EMS. The EMS-equipped boats have completed **27 fishing trips.** **23 of these trips**	**12 of the 14 active Ghanaian Tuna Purse Seine vessels** have been equipped EMS. The EMS-equipped boats have completed **120 fishing trips.** **116 of these trips have been analyzed** with	**14 of the 14 active Ghanaian Tuna Purse Seine vessels have been equipped EMS**. The EMS-equipped boats have **completed 195 fishing trips**. **195 of these trips have been analyzed** with	**14 of the 14 active Ghanaian Tuna Purse Seine vessels have been equipped EMS**. The EMS-equipped boats have **completed 213 fishing trips** by the end of December 2018. **213 of these trips**	100%	**Completed**

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date [16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
		The Project Coordinator for this output has been selected and completed two trips to Ghana to advance project planning. Both government and private sector continue to support these initiatives.	**have been analyzed** with reports prepared by land-based observers at the Fisheries Commission (FC). 8 land-based and 30 at sea observers have been trained. Image analysis has revealed a number of issues related to compliance with both National and International obligations which the Government of Ghana is investigating and working toward improving compliance.	reports prepared by land-based observers at the Fisheries Commission (FC). Two trainings of land-based observers were completed in 2015 and 2016. MRAG was selected through a competitive bidding process to prepare a **Business Case study** which will address issues of sustainability with mainstreaming the EMS in the Ghanaian tuna purse seine fleet	reports prepared by land-based observers at the Fisheries Commission (FC). Two trainings of land-based observers were completed in 2015 and 2016. In February 2018, the draft **Business Case** was presented to the staff at the Ghana FC and representatives of the tuna industry. The document received a favorable review and the industry indicated its agreement to share costs after the Project involvement is finished.	**have been analyzed** with reports prepared by land-based observers at the Fisheries Commission (FC).16 trips were selected and audited by the Digital Observer Services (DOS). Two trainings of land-based observers were completed in 2015 and 2016. In February 2018, the **Business Case** was presented to the staff at the Ghana FC and representatives of the tuna industry. The document received a favorable review and the industry indicated its agreement to share costs after the Project involvement is finished. The equipment was handed over to the government of		

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date [16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Imple-menta-tion status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
						Ghana during a formal ceremony in January 2019.		
2.2.3 Integrated Monitoring, Control and Surveillance in the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) Region	31 Mar 2019	Establishment of the Intelligence Unit has been completed at FFA, with the Project supporting the continuing appointment of a Data Analyst.	FFA integrated MCS System compiles information on vessel activities from various sources and produces assessments of the risk that vessels have engaged in IUU activities. WCPFC and SPC are the main source of data. A dedicated MCS analyst is in place within the wider Fisheries Operations Division with support of the Project.	FFA integrated MCS System compiles information on vessel activities from various sources and produces assessments of the risk that vessels have engaged in IUU activities. WCPFC and SPC are the main source of data. A dedicated MCS analyst is in place within the wider Fisheries Operations Division with support of the Project. MCS Officers from member countries also attend and participate in regional Surveillance operations as part of their training. **42 MCS Officers (3 females) trained** in the MCS data	FFA integrated MCS System compiles information on vessel activities from various sources and produces assessments of the risk that vessels have engaged in IUU activities. WCPFC and SPC are the main source of data. A dedicated MCS analyst is in place within the wider Fisheries Operations Division with support of the Project. MCS Officers from member countries also attend and participate in regional Surveillance operations as part of their training. **85 MCS Officers trained** in the MCS data analysis work	FFA integrated MCS System compiles information on vessel activities from various sources and produces assessments of the risk that vessels have engaged in IUU activities. WCPFC and SPC are the main source of data. A dedicated MCS analyst is in place within the wider Fisheries Operations Division with support of the Project. The activities supported under the project are now fully integrated into the FFA work program. MCS Officers from member countries also attend and participate in regional Surveillance	100%	**Completed**

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date [16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
				analysis work during FFA/QUAD operations, Regional MCS Data Analysis training and in-country Coaching and mentoring programs.	during FFA/QUAD operations, Regional MCS Data Analysis training and in-country Coaching and mentoring programs. Member MCS Officers work under MCS analyst as part of their MCS data analysis training during regional surveillance operations at the FFA headquarters.	operations as part of their training. **91 MCS Officers trained** in the MCS data analysis work during FFA/QUAD operations, Regional MCS Data Analysis training and in-country Coaching and mentoring programs. Member MCS Officers work under MCS analyst as part of their MCS data analysis training during regional surveillance operations at the FFA headquarters. FFA started work to review the Pacific Islands Regional Fisheries Observer Courses for debriefer, trainer, assessor and frontline manager.		
2.2.4 Assessment supply chains for Catch Documentation Schemes	Jan 2016	The Project has **completed an analysis of the all main global tuna supply chains** to identify possible	The Project has **completed an analysis of the main global tuna supply chains** to identify possible	The *Design options for the development of tuna catch documentation schemes* authored	Successfully completed in 2016.	Successfully completed in 2016	100%	**Completed**

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date [16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
(CDS)		weaknesses that would allow entry of IUU products into the markets. The drafting of the *Design options for the development of tuna catch documentation schemes* is now underway. This work integrates with similar work that FAO has been mandated to develop for all fisheries in the world	weaknesses that would allow entry of IUU products into the markets. Based on this, *Design options for the development of tuna catch documentation schemes* were developed, reviewed externally and internally and will be published in the next months.	by Gilles Hosch were published as an FAO Technical Paper on 25 October 2016.				
Component 3. Reducing Ecosystem Impacts of Tuna Fishing								
3.1.1 Shark data	30 June 2019	**A detailed inventory of t-RFMO shark data is partially prepare**d and is planned for release in in late 2015. **Data improvement and harmonization initiatives under way**, but have not yet been endorsed by t-RFMOs. One field study of whale shark post-	**A detailed global inventory of t-RFMO shark data completed** in 2015 and available through prototype t-RFMO Shark Browser. IATTC has **completed a data inventory** (metadata) and an identification of sampling constraints for six countries in Central	**A detailed global inventory of t-RFMO shark data completed** in 2015 and available through prototype t-RFMO Shark Browser. IATTC has **completed a data inventory** (metadata) and an identification of sampling constraints for six countries in Central	**A detailed global inventory of t-RFMO shark data completed** in 2015. Prototype t-RFMO Shark Browser will be further developed as a stand-alone application by SPC in 2018. IATTC has **completed a data inventory** (metadata) and an	**A detailed global inventory of t-RFMO shark data completed** in 2015. Prototype t-RFMO Shark Browser is being further developed as a stand-alone application by SPC and incorporated into the BMIS system. IATTC **completed a data inventory**	>100%	**Completed with additional activities ongoing** Data sharing is a sensitive issue that requires carefully considered approaches. Data confidentiality issues are ongoing challenges to compilations and analyses. Given the very different starting points in IATTC and WCPFC with regard to

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date[16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
		release mortality has been initiated with ABNJ partner NOAA.	America. A Project proposal for a bycatch data exchange (compilation) protocol (BDEP) based on a CCSBT model was populated by WCPFC. One **field study** of whale shark post-release mortality has been initiated with ABNJ partner NOAA.	America. A Project proposal for a bycatch data exchange (compilation) protocol (BDEP) based on a CCSBT model was populated by WCPFC and IOTC. WCPFC and IATTC have both initiated **shark post-release mortality tagging studie**s with co-funding from the EU.	identification of sampling constraints for six countries in Central America, which led to the development of a follow-up project for port-sampling in Central America to improve shark data. A Project proposal for a bycatch data exchange (compilation) protocol (BDEP) based on a CCSBT model was populated by WCPFC and IOTC **Shark post-release mortality tagging studies** with co-funding from the EU ongoing in WCPFC and IATTC.	(metadata) and an identification of sampling constraints for six countries in Central America. This led to a port sampling project funded initially by the Project and now funded by IATTC through 2019 and possibly beyond. A Project proposal for a bycatch data exchange (compilation) protocol (BDEP) based on a CCSBT model was populated by WCPFC and IOTC **Shark post-release mortality tagging studies** with co-funding from the EU were completed in WCPFC and IATTC.		shark data, and more so in comparison to the other three t-RFMOs, achieving the same improvements across t-RFMOs (i.e. harmonization) is less important than achieving meaningful progress in each one. Initiatives to summarize bycatch data, e.g. BDEP, will not improve data quality per se, but will identify areas where further work is necessary. It is difficult to conduct post-release mortality tagging studies on a species for which intentional catch is proscribed (whale shark).
3.1.2 Shark assessment and management	31 Dec 2018	Coordination with IATTC on assessment selection and methods is ongoing.	New methods involving indicators, ecological risk assessment and data-poor stock assessment	The first of four stock status assessments, for **Pacific-wide bigeye thresher shark, was completed** in	The first of four stock status assessments, for **Pacific-wide bigeye thresher shark, was released** in	The first of four stock status assessments, for **Pacific-wide bigeye thresher shark,** was released in	>100%	**Completed with additional activities ongoing** Many, if not all, of the assessments were for data-poor species

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date[16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
		The first of four **stock status assessments has been initiated** ahead of schedule in response to a request from CCSBT to coordinate a global southern hemisphere porbeagle study. Once WCPFC agrees a new Shark Research Plan in August, priorities for the remaining three assessments will become clearer.	frameworks are being developed for the southern hemisphere porbeagle and Pacific-wide bigeye thresher. The first of four stock status assessments, on the **southern hemisphere stock of porbeagle shark, is underway** as a joint effort between CCSBT and WCPFC. The second assessment, on the **Pacific-wide bigeye thresher shark**, will be delivered to the WCPFC Scientific Committee in July 2016.	September 2016 and contributed to the CITES COP17. This assessment, along with a second assessment on the **southern hemisphere porbeagle shark,** undertaken in cooperation with CCSBT, will be reviewed by WCPFC's SC in 2017. The third assessment, on **Pacific-wide silky shark,** demonstrates a new level of collaboration between WCFPC and IATTC. A number of **Project shark management products** have been submitted to, and considered or adopted by, the WCPFC including an analysis of whale shark interactions which resulted in the adoption by WCPFC of safe	September 2016, contributed to the CITES COP17 and was presented to WCPFC's SC in August 2017 where the SC recommended that the WCPFC consider management options. The second assessment on the **southern hemisphere porbeagle shark,** undertaken in cooperation with CCSBT, was presented to WCPFC's SC in August 2017 and was accepted. The third assessment, on **Pacific-wide silky shark**, undertaken in cooperation with IATTC, has been initiated. IATTC produced a paper for their Scientific Committee (SAC) Meeting in 2017. A paper on data preparation for the silky shark stock	September 2016, contributed to the CITES COP17 and was presented to WCPFC's SC in August 2017 where the SC recommended that the WCPFC consider management options. The second assessment on the **southern hemisphere porbeagle shark,** undertaken in cooperation with CCSBT, was presented to WCPFC's SC in August 2017 and was accepted. The third assessment, on **Pacific-wide silky shark**, undertaken in cooperation with IATTC, and the fourth Pacific-wide shark stock status assessment for **whale shark** were completed and both assessments were endorsed by the WCPFC		requiring novel, and perhaps, ground-breaking approaches. Access to confidentially-held data is also a challenge, but one that is being creatively overcome

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date[16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
				release guidelines for encircled animals (including whale sharks) in December 2015, three years after safe releases were mandated. Project products also assist the WCPFC as it struggles with as yet unresolved issues on shark finning and shark management.	status assessment was submitted to the WCPFC's SC in August 2017 by the TCSB. The fourth Pacific-wide shark stock status assessment for **whale shark is ongoing.**	Scientific Committee in August 2018. Remaining funds were consolidated and used to fund three additional activities (shark limit reference point study (co-funded) by WCPFC, alternative assessment methods for the oceanic whitetip shark, and data preparation for blue and shortfin mako sharks in the Chilean SE Pacific swordfish fishery).		
3.1.3 Bycatch mitigation information system (BMIS)	31 Aug 2019	BMIS enhancement work underway First workshop being planned for the Pacific (primarily) on sea turtles with ABNJ partner NOAA Recommendations for mitigation and management under the ABNJ project not yet available.	BMIS enhancement work underway; system upgrade has been delayed but is expected to start soon and under an accelerated work plan can be completed well within the project timeframe. First workshop on sea turtles was held 16-19 February 2016 with second	BMIS launched in May 2017; content updates will continue through 2018. Sea turtle mitigation workshops completed in February and November 2016. First shark post-release mortality workshop held in January 2017;	BMIS launched in May 2017; content updates will continue through 2018. Training session with a problem-solving workshop centered on using BMIS to address bycatch issues held in Nouméa in 2018. Sea turtle mitigation	BMIS launched in May 2017; content updates will continue through 2019. A problem-solving workshop centered on using BMIS to address bycatch issues held in Nouméa in 2018. Sea turtle mitigation workshops	95%	**On track** Data sharing for bycatch can be particularly problematic, especially for those t-RFMOs which do not themselves hold observer data (e.g. ICCAT). A successful approach is expected to require convening willing data holders as participants (bottom-up) rather than obtaining

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date [16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
			sea turtle workshop confirmed for 3-4 and 7-8 November 2016. Recommendations for mitigation and management await the results of the second workshops. .	second shark workshop planned for 2018. Recommendations for mitigation and management for sea turtles will be discussed at WCPFC SC13 in August 2017. Mitigation and management for sharks awaits the tagging results	workshops completed in February and November 2016. First shark post-release mortality workshop held in January 2017; second shark workshop planned for 2018. Recommendations for mitigation and management for sea turtles will be discussed at WCPFC SC13 in August 2017. Mitigation and management for sharks awaits the tagging results	completed in February and November 2016. First shark post-release mortality workshop held in January 2017; and second workshop (joint analysis of tagging results) was held in June 2019 and presented to WCPFC Scientific Committee in August 2019. Information from the workshop is being used in stock assessments and for management advice.		consensus among all members of a t-RFMO (top-down).
3.2.1 Seabird mitigation longliners Indian Ocean and Atlantic Ocean	30 Sep 2019	BirdLife conducted a CCSBT-hosted meeting to develop measures for assessing the effectiveness of mitigation measures, and two workshops for fleet outreach in Korea and China. **Two at-sea trials** of best practice	BirdLife conducted a CCSBT-hosted meeting to develop measures for assessing the effectiveness of mitigation measures, and two workshops for fleet outreach in Korea and China. **Eight at-sea trials** of best practice	**Ten at-sea trials** of best practice mitigation measures have been undertaken, and five trainings of Korean and Chinese fisheries observers successfully completed. **Six national awareness workshops**	**Ten at-sea trials** of best practice mitigation measures have been undertaken, and five trainings of Korean and Chinese fisheries observers successfully completed. **Nine national awareness workshops**	**Ten at-sea trials** of best practice mitigation measures have been undertaken, and five trainings of Korean and Chinese fisheries observers successfully completed. **13 national awareness workshops**	98%	**On track** The Electronic Observer System has been a challenging project and eventually had to be abandoned within South Africa, as fishing industry have incorrectly assumed the project is related to compliance and reporting, and have thus resisted the

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date[16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
		mitigation measures have been undertaken, and training of Korean fisheries observers successfully completed. This built on significant progress that BirdLife and South Korea had achieved before the Project start. A key learning from the first year of work has led to significant adaptation of the implementation strategy.	mitigation measures have been undertaken, and five trainings of Korean and Chinese fisheries observers successfully completed. **Port-based outreach activities** and regional seabird bycatch data analysis workshops are under preparation. Piloting of the use of EMS for monitoring seabird bycatch is under discussion with South Africa and Brazil.	focussing on issues relating to seabird bycatch in tuna fishing in key fleets were held in 2016 and 2017. **27 vessel visits** have been conducted on foreign-flagged pelagic longline in South Africa and will be extended to Suva (Fiji) for engagement with the Chinese fleet. **Two sea trips for data collection** onboard local Namibian tuna longliners were conducted, providing the first ever data on seabird bycatch and mitigation measure use for this fleet. **Two Regional Seabird Bycatch Pre-assessment workshops** held early in 2017.	focussing on issues relating to seabird bycatch in tuna fishing in key fleets **Four observer training workshops** covering seabird bycatch issues and practical implementation of bycatch mitigation measures and at-sea data collection, with participation from Korean, Namibian, Indonesian and South African observers. . **75 vessel visits in Cape Town, South Africa and 99 vessels in Suva, Fiji.** **13 sea trips for data collection** onboard local Namibian and South African Tuna longliners. **Two Regional Seabird Bycatch**	focussing on issues relating to seabird bycatch in tuna fishing in key fleets. **Four observer training workshops** covering seabird bycatch issues and practical implementation of bycatch mitigation measures and at-sea data collection, with participation from Korean, Namibian, Indonesian and South African observers. **89 vessel visits in Cape Town, South Africa and more than 200 individual vessels visited in Suva, Fiji.** **25 sea trips for data collection** onboard local Namibian and South African Tuna longliners. **Two Regional Seabird Bycatch**		implementation.

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date [16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
					Pre-assessment workshops in 2017 and **a global data preparation workshop** held in Cusco, Peru in 2018.	**Pre-assessment workshops** in 2017 **a global data preparation workshop** held in 2018. A **final seabird bycatch assessment workshop** was held in South Africa in February 2019.		
3.2.2 Purse-seine trials of bycatch mitigation	30 June 2019	Contract between WWF and ISSF established; experimental designs for sea trials, focusing on purse seine bycatch mitigation approaches for small tuna/sharks completed which take into account the preceding sea trials, funded by other sources. Equipment (satellite linked echo-sounder buoys) procured, contact with vessel owner established and cruise initiated in the Pacific starting in mid-June, 2015.	Since mid-2015, in excess **of 249 sea days** in six sea trial activities have been expended in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans in support of testing purse seine bycatch mitigation approaches. **Seven Skippers Training Workshops** have been conducted in Indonesia, Peru, Ecuador, Korea, France, Spain, China, and Ghana involving **464 participants**.	The cumulative total of **sea days is in excess of 375** since initiation of the project. A total of **32 Skippers Training Workshops** have been conducted, involving **1,352 participant**s involving project funding.	The cumulative total of **sea days is in excess of 550** since initiation of the Project. ISSF has thus far conducted **23 Sea Trial activities** to test various methods for purse seine bycatch mitigation methods **47 Skippers Training Workshops** have been conducted, involving nearly **2,000 participants**	The cumulative total of **sea days is in excess of 640** since initiation of the Project. ISSF has thus far conducted **25 Sea Trial activities** to test various methods for purse seine bycatch mitigation methods **59 Skippers Training Workshops** have been conducted, involving **more than 3,000 participants**	>100%	**Completed with additional activities ongoing**

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date [16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
1.1.3 Gillnet bycatch Northern Indian Ocean	30 Sep 2019	Contract between WWF and WWF Pakistan concluded. **Three crew-observers** have been selected, trained, and are currently deployed on eight tuna vessels to collect the required data. Installation of automatic identification systems on tuna gillnet vessels is in process and will be completed by the end of 2015.	**32 crew-observers** have been trained, selected and deployed and in Pakistan crew-observer/logbook coverage is now at 6.2% and will continue to scale to 15% during 2016. Bycatch data and catch data gaps have been identified. **Data collection continues** in Pakistan. Data has been shared with the IOTC Working Party and active coordination is ongoing to improve compliance. **AIS installed on four Pakistani gillnet vessels.** Sri Lanka is coordinating alternative gear configurations and an initial visit with authorities is planned for early	**75 crew-observers** have been trained, selected and deployed and in Pakistan crew-observer/logbook coverage is now at 15%. **Data collection continues** in Pakistan and discussions are ongoing with Government of Pakistan to submit reconciled data to IOTC. **AIS installed on four Pakistani gillnet vessels** and four more are identified. Sri Lanka is coordinating alternative gear configurations and an initial visit with authorities is planned for July 2017. Pilots/trials for gear modification with addition to trials of LED light sticks on	**75 crew-observers** have been trained, selected and deployed and in Pakistan crew-observer/logbook coverage continues to be at 15%. **Data collection continues** in Pakistan and the annual landings of tuna and tuna like species, including bycatch i.e. sharks were calculated and submitted in June 2018 to the Government of Pakistan to meet the deadline of 30 June 2018 for submission to IOTC. **AIS installed on four Pakistani gillnet vessels** and data from units is being acquired through Navama and information is readily being shared with Pakistan Maritime Security Agency.	**75 crew-observers** have been trained, selected and deployed and in Pakistan crew-observer/logbook coverage continues to be at an estimated 12-15%. **Data collection continues** in Pakistan on the annual landings of tuna and tuna like species, including bycatch i.e. sharks. Data were compiled and submitted to the Government of Pakistan. **AIS installed on four Pakistani gillnet vessels** and data from units is being acquired through Navama. Information is being shared with Pakistan Maritime Security Agency. At the national level, a **Marine Programme Advisory**	98%	**On track** with additional activities ongoing.

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date [16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
			2016.	gillnets aiming to reduce marine turtle, shark and cetacean bycatch. Bycatch data and catch data gaps have been identified.	At the national level, a **Marine Programme Advisory Committee** has been established with 16 members to facilitate data uptake, sharing and verification, and seek early recommendations on subjects related but not limited to gear transformation, compliance and data acquisition to IOTC.	**Committee** has been established with 16 members to facilitate data uptake, sharing and verification, and seek early recommendations on subjects related, but not limited, to gear transformation, compliance and data acquisition to IOTC. Procurement of longline gear for gear conversion trials is ongoing. Trials will be carried out under WWF Pakistan lead and funding in collaboration with the industry and the Government of Pakistan beyond the project.		
Component 4. Information and Best Practices Dissemination, Monitoring and Evaluation								
4.1.1 Dissemination of results	31 Dec 2019	External Project communications currently mostly through the **Common Oceans website** and	External Project communications currently mostly through the **Common Oceans website** and	Main communication channels for external Project communications are the renewed	Main communication of Project activities and results are disseminated via the renewed	Main communication of Project activities and results are disseminated via the renewed	90%	**On track** Communication of results and lessons learn will continue until the end of the project and beyond.

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date [16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
		@FAOfish **Twitter.** PMU members are attending **t-RFMO Commission, scientific and other meetings** of relevance to highlight opportunities provided by the Project as well as Project Progress and to foster further engagement of t-RFMO member countries.	@FAOfish **Twitter**. PMU members are attending **t-RFMO Commission, scientific and other meetings** of relevance to highlight opportunities provided by the Project as well as Project Progress and to foster further engagement of t-RFMO member countries.	**Common Oceans ABNJ website** and **Twitter.** There is an average of 12 tweets, including the hashtag #CommonOceans, disseminated per month via the Twitter account FAOFish (17,5 k followers) and FAOPesca (7,7 k followers. A first issue of a **Programmatic Newsletter** was sent out and delivered to 3,200 contact points in June 2017, and it is scheduled to be delivered on a quarterly basis from this point on. PMU members are **attending t-RFMO Commission, scientific and other meetings** of relevance to highlight opportunities	**Common Oceans ABNJ website**, social media and the programmatic newsletter. **The website** is frequently updated with content including news items, documents and information on upcoming events. During the last year,the website had a total of 6,958 users, and 9,494 sessions. Efforts to build **social media presence** have primarily been exercised through FAOs corporate **Twitter** accounts @FAOFish (22.5k followers) and the Spanish equivalent @FAOPesca (9.7k followers) with support from PMU members, posting tweets labelled with hashtag #CommonOceans. The hashtag is increasingly used by	**Common Oceans ABNJ website**, social media and the programmatic newsletter. **The website** is frequently updated with content including news items, documents and information on upcoming events. During the last year, the website had a total of 8,396 users, and 11,386 sessions. Efforts to build **social media presence** have primarily been exercised through FAOs corporate **Twitter** accounts @FAOFish (27.9k followers) and the Spanish equivalent @FAOPesca (10.5k followers) with support from PMU members, posting tweets labelled with hashtag #CommonOceans. **The programmatic**		

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date[16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Imple-menta-tion status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
				provided by the Project as well as Project Progress and to foster further engagement of t-RFMO member countries.	Project and partners, and is now at an average of 24 per month (including 1937 retweets and 2132 likes). **The programmatic newsletter** was launched in June 2017 and five issues have been distributed since its start. The Newsletter mailing list was extended from 4,233 to 5,267, and is updated on a regular basis. PMU members are **attending t-RFMO Commission, scientific and other meetings** to foster further engagement of t-RFMO member countries, but also other international events.	**newsletter** was launched in June 2017 and ten issues have been distributed since its start. The Newsletter mailing list currently includes 5,330 recipients and is updated on a regular basis. PMU members are **attending t-RFMO Commission, scientific and other meetings** to foster further engagement of t-RFMO member countries, but also other international events.		
4.1.2 Results and next steps	31 Dec 2019	**Project Progress continuously monitored** and documented at all levels. Results as	Project **Progress continuously monitored** and documented at all levels.	Project **Progress continuously monitored** and documented at all levels.	Project **Progress continuously monitored** and documented at all levels.	Project **Progress continuously monitored** and documented at all levels.	95%	**On track**One more PPR and Terminal Report to be completed.

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date [16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
		well as catalytic actions and projection of expected steps in scaling-up not applicable at this early stage of implementation.	Results as well as catalytic actions and projection of expected steps in scaling-up not applicable at this early stage of implementation. The PMU prepared and submitted **four Project Progress Reports and one Project Implementation Review.**	The PMU prepared and submitted **six 6-monthly Project Progress Reports** and **two yearly Project Implementation Reviews** in line with FAO and GEF reporting requirements.	The PMU prepared and **submitted eight 6-monthly Project Progress Reports** and **three yearly Project Implementation Reviews** in line with FAO and GEF reporting requirements.	The PMU prepared and **submitted ten 6-monthly Project Progress Reports** and **four yearly Project Implementation Reviews** in line with FAO and GEF reporting requirements.		
4.1.3 IW:LEARN	31 Dec 2019	There haven't been any GEF International Waters Conferences since Project Start.	The **8th GEF International Waters Conference** (IWC8) was held in Sri Lanka from May 09-13 2016. The Project was present with a strong delegation including three PMU members (Fogelgren, Clarke and Hett) and six project partner representatives including WWF, Fiji, ISSF, BirdLife South Africa, and Seychelles. In addition, the Project organized	The **8th GEF International Waters Conference** (IWC8) was held in Sri Lanka from 09-13 May 2016. The Project was present with a strong delegation including three PMU members and six project partner representatives including WWF, Fiji, ISSF, BirdLife South Africa, and Seychelles. In addition, during the IWC8, the Project organized an EMS experience	The **8th GEF International Waters Conference** (IWC8) was held in Sri Lanka from May 09-13 2016 with strong project presence. The 9th GEF International Waters Conference will be taking place in November 2018 in Marrakesh, Morocco. A more in depth exchange of **experiences across the EMS pilots** took	The **8th GEF International Waters Conference** (IWC8) was held in Sri Lanka from 09-13 May 2016 with strong project presence. The 9th GEF International Waters Conference took place from 05-08 November 2018 in Marrakesh, Morocco with project presence. An in-depth exchange of **experiences across**	90%	**On track** The 8th GEF International Waters Conference was mostly focusing on freshwater, making it challenging to contribute to the overarching learning session.

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date[16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
			an EMS experience exchange to provide a first opportunity for the two electronic monitoring system (EMS) pilots currently ongoing in Ghana and Fiji and under preparation in Seychelles and South Africa to exchange experiences and discuss challenges since the activities have started.	exchange to provide a first opportunity for the two electronic monitoring system (EMS) pilots currently ongoing in Ghana and Fiji and under preparation in Seychelles and South Africa. A more in depth exchange of experiences across the EMS pilots is planned for early 2018.	place in Ghana in February 2018 and a second exchange is planned in Fiji in early 2019.	**the EMS pilots** took place in Ghana in February 2018. One **IW:Learn Experience Note** submitted.		
4.2.1 Evaluations	31 Dec 2019	First contacts with OED have been established in preparation of the mid-term evaluation in 2016.	Preparations for the Mid Term Evaluation are underway. The evaluation team has been established and will be present during the Project Steering Committee from 06-08 July 2016.	MTE team members joined the Project Steering Committee from 06-08 July 2016 to establish contact and conduct the scoping of the evaluation with project partners. In September and October 2016, MTE team members conducted field missions in five countries (Seychelles, FSM, Ghana, Fiji, and Pakistan). During the evaluation, the	**MTE completed** in 2017 and available here.	**MTE completed** in 2017 and available here. **Terminal Evaluation** started in July 2019.	80%	**On track**

Outputs[15]	Expected completion date[16]	Achievements at each PIR[17]					Implementation status (	Comments. Describe any variance[18] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR		
				MTE team conducted more than 100 interviews with over 90 Project stakeholders. The first full draft of the report was distributed to the PSC, PMU and PTF members for feedback and comments in May 2017.				

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):
Max 200 words:

The management of tuna fisheries around the world is complicated by the highly migratory nature of the resources and the wide range of their distribution. A consequence of this feature is that fleets from many countries fish for tunas in both EEZ's and ABNJ, requiring a concerted effort to ensure sustainable utilization whilst conserving biodiversity.

During this FY, joint fisheries management continued to be strengthened through advancements in the implementation of the precautionary approach, via the adoption of harvest strategies, by all tuna RFMOs. The new developments included the progress of harvest strategies development in IOTC, WCPFC and ICCAT with specific timelines for completion adopted, a commitment for starting the further development of harvest strategies in IATTC, and a process to review the existing harvest strategy in CCSBT.

An equally important principle in sustainable fisheries management is the implementation of the ecosystem approach. The project is preparing a proposal for an operationalization plan to be reviewed at a second joint tuna RFMO Working Group on the Ecosystem Approach in September 2019.

Supplementing these efforts, the Project has contributed to the knowledge of the status of shark resources, in particular in the Pacific, with new data made available, for the first time, for assessments of several species over their range of distribution. Studies and workshops also led to the identification of best practices to reduce incidental mortality of species such as marine turtles and whale sharks, and the adoption of measures in WCPFC and IATTC. Workshops were conducted towards compiling existing information on interaction with seabirds, towards improving on the estimates of incidental mortality.

Dissemination of information useful to reduce the impact of bycatch has been a priority for the Project. A global online portal, launched in 2017, continues to facilitate access to information on the performance of bycatch mitigation techniques. Reduction of bycatch of sharks and small tunas in purse-seine fisheries was promoted through at-sea trials of various techniques, followed up by workshops with skippers that included more than 1000 participants, carried out by private sector partners. Longline fishermen were made aware of ways of reducing incidental mortality of seabirds through outreach efforts in various ports and training of on-board observers by a partner NGO.

Actions to combat of IUU fishing has been supported through two main strategies. First, various capacity building efforts aimed at the development of new skills, as well as sharing of knowledge between officials of tuna RFMOs. This included the establishment of a Tuna

Compliance Network, an online-based platform that was launched early in 2017 to exchange information and intelligence between compliance officials of RFMOs, and the development of a document on best practices in MCS, with a wide range of inputs from global practitioners.

The second strategy has been the strengthening of tools for monitoring, control and surveillance and compliance, such as a legal template for implementation of Port State Measures, options for Catch Documentation Schemes, and automatic updating of the global record of authorized vessels shared by all tuna RFMOs. The use of video equipment to supplement compliance work in developing States has been tested in three countries in large portions of key fishing fleets, with the projects in Ghana, Fiji and Seychelles being completed.

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?
Max 200 words:

Some of the outcomes are actually achieved when the member countries of the RFMOs agree to the adoption of adequate conservation and management measures. This joint adoption always requires political commitment from all the countries involved. At times, adoption of key measures has been hampered by the need for consensus from the many countries involved, which is not always present.

In other cases, national administrations have not been as diligent as needed in taking the administrative steps required to ensure sustainability of an outcome, even when the support of all stakeholders, including private sector, has been secured. This has created temporary disruptions and delays.

As expected, as we approach the closure of the Project, PMU staff seek other employment opportunities to maintain the continuity of their employment. With six months formally left in the Project, there is insufficient time left in the Project to recruit replacements. This has increased the individual workload on the PMU staff at a time when many activities are reaching their final stages.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating[19]	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating[20]	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	The project is on track to complete most of its scheduled activities, with important impacts on the management of tuna fisheries.
Budget Holder	S	S	Same as LTO
Lead Technical Officer[21]	S	S	The project has made good progress in all areas and and excellent progress in a few particular ones. Currently on track.
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	S	S	Same as LTO.

[19] **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

[20] **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

[21] The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

3. Risks

Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	**Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid[22].** If not, what is the new classification and explain.
The project conforms to the pre-approved list of projects excluded from environmental assessment and that the project will have minimal or no adverse environmental or social impacts.	NA

Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
*The following table summarizes risks identified in the **Project Document** and reflects also **any new risks** identified in the course of project implementation. The Notes column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, **as relevant**.*

[22] **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

	Risk	Risk rating[23]	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions[24]	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	The great number and diversity of stakeholders will constrain efficient coordination and implementation of the Project's activities	L	Continuous contacts with all partners to maintain coordination	Ongoing	In the initial stages, it was necessary for all the partners to understand the needs for effective coordination, especially in communications. Repeated coordination and renewed communications from the PMU and the partners has improved the situation.
2	Changes in decision makers or other political events beyond the control of the Project lead to changes in policies and/or support for project objectives and activities.	L	Reporting to all relevant RFMO bodies (e.g. Scientific Committee, Compliance Committee, Plenary Sessions). Contacts with individual countries, especially those who are members of several RFMOs. Support from NGOs, private sector partners.	Ongoing at each meeting of the main and subsidiary bodies of the RFMOs	Given the turnover of officials from member States at the RFMOs, not all delegations were initially aware of the scope of the Project. Communications and reporting at every major meeting of the t-RFMOs is addressing the situation. Furthermore, only three RFMO member States are directly partners of the Project. The remainder of the RFMO members are represented by the Secretariats of the RFMO, who have no executive powers.
3	Gridlock in the t-RFMO decision-making process	M	Contacts with individual countries, especially those who are members of several RFMOs. Support from NGOs and other partners	Ongoing.	Not all RFMO Members are equally keen in adopting some of the most transformational measures such as precautionary approach or EAFM. Lobbying individual delegations by the Project at various times help, but the consensus basis for most RFMO decisions means that a single State opposing might prevent a measure to be adopted. There is tangible risk that the duration of the Project would not be enough for RFMOs to reach the decisions required to implement the transformational change.

[23] GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

[24] If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

	Risk	Risk rating[23]	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions[24]	Notes from the Project Task Force
4	Increases in maritime security threats (e.g., piracy) will adversely influence tuna fisheries.	L	-	-	The piracy threat has diminished radically in recent years in the north-west Indian Ocean, and fleets are returning to traditional fishing grounds. None of the Project activities are directly threatened by piracy.
5	Lack of industry interest	L	Outreach and communications work	Ongoing	While some sectors of the industry remain interested and actively participating in the activities of the project, other sectors have shown much less interest, especially when the Project activities might lead to additional regulations against IUU fishing.
6	Adverse CC impacts compromise the Project's achievements, particularly concerning the ecosystems and biodiversity.	L	Part of the work on the EAFM will provide mechanisms for tracking ecosystem changes that could be related to Climate Change.	-	-
7	PMU staffing insufficient for a project of this size.	M	Maintain funding and provisions to bring in additional manpower as required due to changing conditions or special situations.		The strengthening of the PMU was also recommended by the Mid Term Evaluation.
8	Heavy demands on the time of the project manager, who has been acting as a temporary Executive Secretary and a Science Manager of IOTC	Not considered a risk any longer	Beginning July 1st 2017, a new Executive Secretary was appointed to the post, and the Project Manager returned full-time to his original responsibilities.	-	-

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High):

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
M	**M**	Risks are well managed, although some are beyond the project's (or FAO's) ability to affect, e.g. internal t-RFMO decision-making.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months[25]

The Project's results framework was restructured to follow the suggested reconstructed Theory of Change (Recommendation 5.i of MTE) and was approved by the Project Steering Committee in its 2018 session. The revised results framework is being used for reporting in section 1 of this report. No additional adjustments to the project strategy during the past 12 months.

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes		
Project Outputs		

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	Original NTE: 14 January 2019 Revised NTE: 31 December 2019. Justification: This was recommended by the MTE to allow time for the final elements of the project to be delivered and put in place measures to ensure sustainability. The PSC in its 2017 meeting welcomed and endorsed this

[25] Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

	recommendation.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)?

Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment? Please briefly indicate the gender differences.

Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? How is the project tracking gender impacts and results?

Does the project staff have gender expertise?

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

- closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;
- improving women's participation and decision making; and or
- generating socio-economic benefits or services for women.

Whereas the Project is not directly applying a gender sensitive approach, there are certain project activities that favor a more equal participation of women in the fisheries sector. The Mid Term Evaluation Team looked at these aspects more in detail and found:

- Efforts to address gender issues in Ghana such as giving women access to jobs and learning opportunities within the Project's framework in jobs that were occupied by males. The Fisheries Commission attempted to ensure equal number of women and men were trained on the EMS and hired as team members for the land-observers team. As for the private sector, two of the fishing companies in Ghana had internal policies to increase job opportunities for women in administration and operations in their port offices.
- Efforts have been made by the PMU to collect gender disaggregated data, e.g. numbers of women participating in workshops, trainings and other major events. From April 2014 to December 2017, participation of women in project-related events amounted to 12.7% (221 out of 1660). However, it should be noted that most of these participants were associated with the ISSF Skipper's training workshops (814 individuals). On-board observer training had significant women participants in South Korea – 47% women out of 23 total participants. Some awareness and management workshops also had significant women participation (i.e. Indonesia – 32.4%, Namibia- 48.4% and Pakistan 29.2%).

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.

If applies, please describe the process and current status of on-going/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities

The project does not specifically involve Indigenous Peoples.

7. Stakeholders Engagement

Please report on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable)

If your project had a stakeholder engagement plan, specify whether any new stakeholders have been identified/engaged:

If a stakeholder engagement plan was not requested for your project at CEO endorsement stage, please

- list all stakeholders engaged in the project;
- briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.

This project does not have a specific stakeholder engagement plan, but the stakeholder section in the ProDoc sets out an outline stakeholder engagement plan . All project executing partners listed at the beginning of this report are project stakeholders. Three of them, Organización Productores Asociados Grandes Atuneros Congeladores (OPAGAC), Seychelles Fishing Authority and European Commission DG MARE joined during the implementation phase and committed through co-financing.

The yearly PSC is the main project meeting where project-related decisions are taken.

All decisions at the RFMO level are being taken exclusively by member countries.

One of the recommendations of the MTE was to develop a project partnership strategy document that sets out the role, comparative advantage, responsibilities, agreed activities and deliverables, partner communication and collaboration arrangements, and budgets for the remainder of the Project for each partner. This recommendation was partially accepted and is envisaged for the preparation of the second

8. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval

- Please tell us the story of your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihood and how it is contributing to achieve the expected global environmental benefits
- Please provide the links to publications, video materials, etc.

The decisions that affect the management of marine resources and conservation of biodiversity in the ABNJ are in the hands of countries that share a special interest in the region. These States work together to adopt measures towards sustainable utilization under the framework of Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs). In the RFMOs, member countries make decisions, in principle, based on scientific advice. In order to make an impact on fisheries management in the high-seas, as well as the coastal areas which support critical life stages of the high seas living resources, it needs to be done within the RFMO framework. The sustainable utilization of ABNJ fisheries resources depends mostly of the actions of fishing fleets and their supporting private sector interests, that are the direct responsibility of flag States that comprise the RFMOs. Therefore, the Project focused many of its actions on helping to strengthen the RFMO processes and, in particular, a better performance of member States in complying with the agreed regulations.

Project interventions were grouped in three categories, addressing different issues affecting sustainable utilization. First, was the strengthening of the processes by which science-based advice is used to make management decisions. The project supported, in various ways, the development and adoption of harvest control rules that implement the precautionary approach in all five tuna RFMOs. Once adopted for all majors stocks, the end result will be a much lower risk of over-exploitation. Implementation of the ecosystem approach to fisheries management has followed a similar path of bringing scientists and decision makers in the RFMOs to design feasible implementation roadmaps.

The second category of activities tackled the issue of illegal, unregulated and unreported (IUU) fishing. The Project took a dual strategy of reinforcing compliance and enforcement in RFMOs, by creating support mechanisms for involved officials, and capacity building through supporting certification-based courses that opened up new career paths for men and women in fisheries compliance. The second part of this strategy was to further develop monitoring, control and surveillance tools that are essential in the fight against IUU fishing. This list of expanded tools includes legislation templates for countries implementing Port State Measures, global lists of authorized fishing vessels, design options for traceability systems, system for IUU-risk analyses using heterogeneous data, and pilot studies including fully functional electronic monitoring systems on board fishing vessels in two developing countries.

The third category of interventions seek to reduce the impact of fishing operations on the environment. This includes minimizing the impact of bycatch on marine turtles, seabirds, and small tunas by developing, promoting and disseminating information on best practices to prevent bycatch or ways to conduct safe release of caught animals. The Project also supported improved data collection and analysis of data from fisheries that also catch sharks, to better understand the sustainability of the utilization of various species. Data collection in high-impact fisheries (such as gillnets) allowed quantification of the extent of bycatch for the first time, as well as allowed work with the fisheries communities to promote less-damaging gears.

All this work was conducted with the support of a wide array of partners, not only from the RFMOs, but also from the civil society at a global level, as well as important contributions and support from the private sector.

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing[1]	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval (in M USD)	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019 (in USD)	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project (in M USD)
GEF Agency	FAO	Cash	5	4,757,236	Comment by FAO's Office of Evaluation: The Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) looked into the contributions of FAO and partner's co-financing to the project but not in detail. The contribution of co-financing commitments to the project's immediate result are seen throughout the MTE report. The MTE encourages that a comprehensive look	5
NGO	WWF	Cash	6	8,365,920		8.3
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	20	20,725,142		20.7
NGO	WWF	In-kind	9	10,150,600		10.1
IGO	WCPFC	In-kind	6.3	7,964,470		8
IGO	ICCAT*	In-kind	4.3	4,334,000		4.3
IGO	IOTC*	In-kind	2.5	2,500,000		2.5
IGO	CCSBT	In-kind	1.3	1,252,848		1.3
IGO	IATTC	In-kind	6.3	6,548,150		6.5
IGO	FFA	In-kind	2	4,125,000		4.1
IGO	SPC	In-kind	0.2	186,000		0.2
IGO	PNA*	In-kind	0.4	370,000		0.4
NGO	BLI	In-kind	2.9	4,278,690		4.3
IGO	ACAP*	In-kind	1	992,500		1
Industry	ISSF	In-kind	2.3	6,031,348		6
Government	US NOAA	In-kind	45	74,282,569		74.3

Government	Fiji***	In-kind	0.3	810,769	into co-financing be included in the ToRs of the Terminal Evaluation.	0.8
Government	Ghana	In-kind	1.2	1,261,066		1.2
Non-profit organization	MSC*	In-kind	0.15	150,000		0.2
Industry -	Fiji (FTBOA/FFIA)	In-kind	14.9	59,158,019		59
Industry	ISSA - Ghana MW Brands	In-kind	19.8	46,260,000		46.3
Government	European Commission - DG MARE - NEW Partner**	Cash	-	400,000		0.4
Government	Seychelles Fishing Authority – NEW partner*	In-kind	-	25,000		0
Industry	OPAGAC NEW partner	In-kind	-	86,120		0.1
		TOTAL	**150.85**	**265,015,446**		**265**

*Numbers are PMU estimates

**Cash contribution to WCPFC work

***2018 Information

Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement

Considerable additional co-financing was leveraged by some partners, in particular by industry in Ghana and Fiji and by NOAA.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. DO **Ratings definitions: Highly Satisfactory (HS -** Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as "good practice"); **Satisfactory (S -** Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS -** Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU -** Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U -** Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU -** The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions**: **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as "good practice". **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.